UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,884	05/01/2001	Richard Hayton	CTX-065	5895

21323	7590	10/04/2004	

TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 May 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/4/02 & 3/31/03._

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burd et al.

(U.S. 6,792,607 B1) in view of Marcos et al. (U.S. 6,429,880 B2).

4.   **As to claim 1,** Burd teaches an application having a plurality of objects (server-side

control objects; col. 5, lines 1-25), at least one object having a property (the server-side Control

class ... properties and events; col. 19, line 58 – col. 20, line 2), each property being identified

with an identifier (page:tablelist1:listrow2:label1; col. 14, lines 49-54), associating at least one

property path with one inserted element of the user interface (one or more server-side control

objects map to one or more user interface element; col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 2 and Operation

508 parses the payload ... for processing; col. 14, lines 49-65), the property path including a

concatenation of a plurality of identifiers (page, tablelist1, listrow2, label1; col. 14, lines 49-54),

the concatenation of identifiers defining a path through the objects of the application to a

property at the end of the concatenation (the property values of server-side control objects or

corresponding data, i.e., "12945"; col. 14, lines 49-67 and Figs. 6-7).

5.   However, Burd does not teach components, and inserting at least one element into the

user-interface. Marcos teaches components (components; col. 9, lines 35-51), and inserting at

least one element into the user interface (Element section 504 ... generate template 330; col. 9,

lines 35-44 and Instances of palette can be used to drag and drop HTML elements into the main

component; col. 12, lines 45-46).

6.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Burd and Marcos because it provides a method for binding

user interface objects to application objects visually, and both objects or components are

software objects that provide properties and methods to act on the properties, and it is easier for

developers during application creation and maintain.

7.   **As to claim 2**, Burd does not teach determining a list of property paths associated with

the application, and selecting the property path from the list to associate with the one inserted

element of the user-interface from the list of property path. Marcos teaches determining a list of

property paths associated with the application (Object browser ... to the HTML INPUT element;

col. 10, lines 55-57 and col. 11, lines 61-64), and selecting the property path from the list to

associate with the one inserted element of the user-interface from the list of property path

(Binding flow; col. 14, line 45 – col. 15, line 14).

8.   **As to claim 3**, Burd does not teach receiving a property path description file associated

with the application, the property path description file including a plurality of identifiers

associated with the application and a relationship between the plurality of identifiers. Marcos

teaches receiving a property path description file associated with the application, the property

path description file including a plurality of identifiers associated with the application and a

relationship between the plurality of identifiers (e.g. col. 8, lines 1-27; col. 9, lines 45-59; col. 10,

lines 55-64 and col. 13, lines 42-47).

9.   **As to claim 4**, Burd teaches executing the application, and interacting with the executing

application to determine a plurality of identifiers associated with the application and a

relationship between the plurality of identifiers (e.g. col. 5, lines 1-25; col. 10, lines 13-35 and

col. 14, lines 49-54 and Figs. 1, 6-7).

10.   **As to claim 5**, Burd teaches transmitting a request to register for a property change

message corresponding to the property path associated with the element of the user-interface

(e.g. col. 10, lines 60-67 and col. 15, lines 1-17).

11.   **As to claim 6**, Burd does not teach providing at least one predefined element, and

enabling selection from the at least one predefined element to insert the selected predefined

element into the user interface (Element section 504 ... generate template 330; col. 9, lines 35-44

and Instances of palette can be used to drag and drop HTML elements into the main component;

col. 12, lines 45-46).

12.   **As to claim 7**, Marcos teaches the predefined element comprises one of an image type

user-interface element, an iterator type user-interface element, a text type user-interface element,

a hidden type user-interface element, a value type user-interface element, a slider type user-

interface element, a tree view type user-interface element, a button type user interface element,

an iframe type user-interface element, a tab type user-interface element, a flipflop type user-

interface element, a desk type user-interface element, a dropdown type user-interface element, a

radio type user-interface element, and a script type user-interface element (See Figs. 4A-4D, 5, 7;

col. 6, lines 35-49, col. 8, line 28 – col. 9, line 16).

13.   **As to claim 8**, it corresponds to the method claim of claim 1 above and is rejected under

the same rejection.

14.   **As to claims 9-14**, see rejections of claims 2-7 above.

15.   **As to claim 15**, Burd teaches the client node including a user interface having one or

more elements (Fig. 1). However, Burd does not teach the client node including a client portion

of the property connector module. Marcos teaches the client node including a client portion of

the property connector module (component window; col. 9, line 30 – col. 10, line 19).

16.   **As to claim 16**, Burd as modified teaches the server node including the application, and a

server portion of the property connector module (server-side class control library; col. 6, lines

62-66, non-user-interface server component 130; col. 7, lines 46-48).

Conclusion

17.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

-     Emmelmann (U.S. 2003/0074634 A1) teaches a method to create server side Internet

      application by placing interactive server side components on Internet pages.

-     Turner et al. (U.S. 2001/0018648 A1) teaches "a method and system for assembling and

      utilizing components in component object systems".

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Diem K Cao whose telephone number is (703) 305-5220 or (571)

272-3760 (effective November 1st 2004). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -

Thursday, 9:00AM - 5:00PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703) 305-9678 or (571) 272-3756 (effective

November 1st 2004). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Diem Cao

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100